Where A Witch Hunt of the Bar Leads, P. 4

Humphrey Lifts the Curtain on Censorship of Nuclear and Foreign Policy Matters, Page 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VII, NO. 8 FEBRUARY 23, 1959 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

An Indispensable Man — For German Military Revival

A mixture of identification and superstition, humanity and cant, leads critics to offer the tributes Mr. Dulles has been receiving in his illness. That primitive fear lest the departed come back and take vengeance leads men to say nothing but good not only of the dead but of those who might be dying. The chorus is swelled by the courtier-like tendency of officials and journalists to demonstrate their own sense of propriety and deference to fashion by repeating the *cliches* of the moment. The labored articles on the Secretary's indispensability which fill the newspaper pages are an up-to-date version of the whispers that filled royal courts when a dominant Minister lay stricken. This deafening buzz-buzz stupefies the public mind.

A Man Who Trusts Nobody

It is noteworthy that even in this chorus one note is missing. No one pretends that in his six years at State Department Mr. Dulles has won affection. The Department knows the Secretary as a cold, arrogant and ruthless man who has been exhausting himself running around the world because he really trusts no one. Since the world each man inhabits is his own mirror, the man who thinks no one is to be trusted is the man who concludes from observation of himself that others, too, are not what they seem. Indeed no man in our time has so succeeded in creating an image of himself which he must know to be false. A lifelong servant of the most materialistic forces in our society, a Big Lawyer for the Big Money, a pre-war apologist for Japanese aggression and Nazi expansion, an exponent of Macchiavellianism so long as the Axis was winning, an advocate of a Christian peace as soon as its defeat was foreseen, Mr. Dulles by his constant invocation of Christianity and freedom has succeeded in making these ideals suspect in the minds of uncommitted millions who hear in them only the tom-toms beating for a new war.

A Heady Readiness to Gamble With Death

It is a commentary on the limitation of men's imagination that one elderly man's struggle with a terrible illness evokes sympathy even from those who dislike all he stands for, but his proclaimed readiness to plunge the world into war over Berlin evokes no protesting image of the countless human beings he would thus consign to agony. How often this man who clings so fiercely to life has been ready to plunge the world into death! Ever since that first Indo-Chinese crisis in 1954, he has shown a heady readiness to gamble the lives of all of us. A psychologist looking at the pattern would infer self-destructive tendencies unwholesome in a Secretary of State. The same sense of humanity which leads one to wish Mr. Dulles well in his personal struggle must also lead one to hope that he will not return to office.

Krupp Ready for His Old Business Again

People the world over would feel safer if Mr. Dulles were to retire, particularly because of the issue which is his main concern. As a State Department official told the *Wall Street Journal* (Feb. 16), in forecasting the possibility that Mr. Dulles might continue part-time, "He's not going to fuss with the future of Cuba or Japan's troubles with Korea. He's saving himself for Germany." His retirement would seem in this respect an historic turning-point. The speech by Senator Mansfield the day before the news of the Secretary's illness was another indication of the revolt within Democratic ranks against bi-partisan cold war policies which serve only to further the revival in Germany and Japan of those same strongly centralized States, combining a highly monopolistic capitalism with a strong military tradition, which we so recently spent so much blood and treasure to put down. Krupp is back on the scene, participating disturbingly in Germany's first nuclear project. An interview with him (*Washington Star*, Feb. 15) concludes cutely that while "Krupp is reluctant to get into a field that twice has reduced the family firm to rubble" if NATO pressed him to manufacture arms he would "under certain conditions" do it again. "We must not forget reality," Krupp told his interviewer smugly. Neither must we.

Germans Want to Deal With Moscow Themselves

The weakness of the Mansfield speech was its readiness to leave the German problem to be settled between East and West Germans. The terms of the peace can only provide safeguards against a third German try if written by the Allies of the last war. Our safety as well as theirs calls for strict provisions against allowing the Germans to have atomic, bacteriological or chemical weapons. But Mr. Dulles and the Adenauer regime want to keep the cold war going until the West is begging them to make such weapons again. Then, in their own time, the Germans will deal with Moscow themselves. When that day comes, the West will have lost control.

All the talk here of a new flexibility on the part of Mr. Dulles reveals when examined only a deft reshuffling of the same stale cards. The strategy is to give the appearance of flexibility without the reality. For all our supposed concern with free elections, the one offer we will not make is to demilitarize and neutralize Germany in return for them. This would liquidate the East German dictatorship, open the way for disengagement, and allow East Europe to breathe more freely again. The choice is between East European liberation and German military revival. The two are incompatible. The latter has been Mr. Dulles' real concern. His retirement might make possible a shift toward wiser policies.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lord Simon and Earl Russell Launch A New Move to Stop Spread of Atomic Weapons

Britain Urged to Renounce the Bomb and Form Club of Non-Nuclear Powers

Everyone admits the spread of nuclear weapons will increase the danger of war but few are doing anything to stop it. In the House of Lords Feb. 11, Lord Simon of Wythenshawe with the support of Bertrand Russell, filed a motion which may launch a world-wide campaign. It urged the British government (1) to negotiate an agreement with the non-nuclear powers "to renounce the manufacture, ownership and use of nuclear weapons", (2) "to offer ourselves similarly to renounce any such weapons" and (3) to persuade the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. "jointly to sponsor a worldwide system of inspection under the auspices of the United Nations to enforce effectively any such agreement."

Conventional Thinking Still Predominates

The House of Lords is now England's most influential debating society rather than a legislative chamber, and the motion (like more than 90 percent of the motions in the upper House) "was, by leave, withdrawn." But Earl Russell (see box below) indicated that Lord Simon's motion was only "a first move." The motion was at once opposed by the Conservative and Labour spokesmen in the Lords but drew a friendly response from the Liberal leader, Lord Rea. The debate strikingly illustrated the hold of conventional thinking on the minds of the leadership in Britain, as elsewhere.

Almost Tongue-in-Cheek Parody

There were passages which sounded as if they might have been written by Max Beerbohm. The Earl of Home, the Conservative leader, soared gracefully into the proposition that he did not "believe it was possible to insulate invention and sources of power from possible use in war. Medicine, the most humane of science," the Earl explained, "could at once cure and kill." No one rose to ask the eloquent peer whether there might not be a strong case for the abolition of medicine, too, if its practitioners spent all their energies on developing better ways to kill more patients.

Hard Man to Convince

The most interesting theory put forward in opposition to the Simon motion was by Lord Strang, who as Sir William Strang was Permanent Under-Secretary of the Foreign Office before World War II. Sir William in 1938 was one of the principal architects of the Munich Pact, and in 1939 facilitated the Nazi-Soviet Pact by taking a slow boat to Moscow while Ribbentrop negotiated that coup with Molotov. Sir William was thereupon elevated to the peerage. In opposing the Simon motion, Lord Strang "was not entirely convinced that a mere increase in the number of States possessing nuclear weapons would necessarily increase the danger of war. There was at least a possibility that this would broaden the basis of . . . stability." Lord Strang is a strong-minded man. Last time he was "not entirely convinced" that Hitler meant war until bombs fell on London.

Lord Coleraine on the same high plane opposed the Simon motion as constituting "a moral surrender." Lord Henderson said it was "not practical politics." The Earl of Dundee thought the important thing "was never to allow Russia to believe that she would have a preponderance in nuclear power." Lord Birdwood exclaimed, "I would rather contemplate a world in which there was nothing left to rescue than live on in a world which had been absorbed into a system of life which I abhor. . . ."

Comforting News

"In addition to the growing stock of kiloton bombs, the production of British megaton weapons is proceeding steadily. The last series of British tests and the valuable exchange of information with the United States have enabled important technical advances to be made in the design of nuclear warheads. This will permit a significant increase in the rate of production."

—New British White Paper on Defense, Feb. 1959.

Church Lords Oppose Nuclear Arms

But all the response was not negative. Lord Rea asked, "Why should we attract an onslaught on this undefended island by the provocative possession of a virtually useless contribution to American nuclear arms? That would be the very reverse of a deterrent." Three Church Lords supported Lord Simon. The Bishop of Manchester thought the use of nuclear arms "was in all circumstances morally indefensible;" the Bishop of Portsmouth said it was "utterly repulsive to man's moral sense," and found the Simon motion "a refreshing approach." So did the Bishop of Chichester.

Lord Wilmot said renunciation of nuclear weapons by Britain and the smaller powers "would make war less likely." Lord Wise, who said he was speaking for East Anglia, where the nuclear bases are, said people "could no longer wait passively for the statesmen, who were becoming weary." Lord John Boyd-Orr drew back, saying the Simon motion implied Britain withdraw from NATO "and try to assume the role of a world peace party. That was pretty strong medicine for either of the political parties here." He seemed still to believe in the deterrent value of Britain's H-bombs.

Dangerous Symbols of Independence

A famous physician, once a noted professor of physiology at Cambridge, now Lord Adrian, warned that "if nuclear bombs became one of the symbols of national independence, no one could doubt that the danger of a general war would be far greater." He thought Britain would deserve thanks of the world "if we could prevent this happening by denying ourselves the right to use them."

Lord Simon, one time Liberal Lord Mayor of Manchester (no relation to Sir John Simon), saw his motion as a chance for Britain to recover in the moral realm that world leadership it can no longer exercise on the military plane. He has launched a hopeful initiative which deserves world-wide support.

Russell Says Mankind Must Unite Against the Bomb as Against A New Plague

"He [Earl Bertrand Russell] regarded the [Simon] motion as a first move, and a practicable move he hoped, in a long campaign to ensure the continued existence of the human race. . . . There was a feeling that in any opposition to war there was something that was left-wing or pro-Russion. That was not his feeling at all. He was concerned with man, be he Chinese, French, Russian, American or British.

"What was wanted was a different kind of outlook. Hitherto we had thought of nuclear weapons as being in the possession of the east and west, with the east being a threat to the west and the west being a threat to the east. This was not a sensible way to look at it. Nuclear weapons were a threat to mankind, and against this threat man ought to unite. They would unite if it was the Black Death, in order to take the sanitary measures to avoid this appalling evil.....

"We had got used to war. We had to get unused to it and it was not an easy effort. Unless we did, those who could not make the effort were contributing their little bit to the extinction of our species. (Cheers)."

—House of Lords, Feb. 11, The Times (London) Feb. 12.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Name of Security, Advocates of Nuclear Test Cessation Gagged

Senator Humphrey Lifts the Curtain on Foreign Policy Censorship

While increasing Congressional attention has been paid in recent years to "freedom of information" in the executive branch of the government, little has been focussed on the mushrooming habit of holding more and more Congressional hearings behind closed doors and censoring the transcript before release.

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, in a speech Feb. 13 accepting a "Speaker of the Year" award at Northwestern University, provided the first public analysis of the peculiar standards applied in making these so-called "security deletions" from the text of executive committee sessions.

At the same time he called attention to a paradoxical situation in information policy on nuclear testing. He said that while the stated policy of the government was to seek for an agreement on test cessation, "defenders of this public policy are 'gagged' while those who oppose it within the Administration have relatively free hand in expressing their opposition."

Why Can't Dr. Killian Speak Out, Too?

Senator Humphrey said that while the AEC and the Defense Department are allowed to question nuclear test policy publicly, neither Dr. James R. Killian, head of the President's Science Advisory Committee, nor any of its members "can publicly say they agree with the policy if their statements imply they are speaking as a member of the Committee."

"All I can say is," Senator Humphrey continued, "that this is a rather peculiar way to run a government. One might even ask, what about the fellow at the top? What does he think about all this? Why doesn't he speak out so that we might know just how firm the policy is?

Senator Humphrey said it took his Senate disarmament subcommittee last year "literally months to find people in the executive branch of the Government who were willing to discuss the problem of the detection of nuclear weapons tests." He said much of the information necessary to intelligent discussion is still classified "some of it for reasons that are difficult to understand."

How the Censor's Erratic Blue-Pencil Works

The Senator gave some cases to illustrate. The first was "information relating to the weight of atomic weapons relative to their yield is classified." With this he had no quarrel. He felt it was "clearly sensitive."

Case No. 2 he called "questionable". This was a case where a private witness who had been serving the government in a specific capacity "makes recommendations regarding future policies on the relation between disarmament and surprise attack. His views are censored because they are agreed to by one agency but may be opposed by another."

Case No. 3 was the complete blanket of censorship covering the problems of distinguishing earthquakes from nuclear explosions and of perfecting new instruments of detection and identification. The Senator said this had nothing to do with weapons but only with seismology.

"We are told," the Senator revealed, "that if instruments are placed deep in the earth, this may be an excellent means of detecting and identifying nuclear explosions and earthquakes. But you cannot be told how the experiments will be conducted, where they will be conducted, who is responsible for carrying on the research, and when it is expected to be completed. Yet the experiments would have great interest for seismologists the world over and could have a significant impact on the Geneva negotiations."

The fourth case cited by the Senator is the deletion of testimony "on the ground that the witness is a consultant to the advisory body to the President." This is used to "gag" Dr. Killian and his committee members.

Blacking Out the Soviet Viewpoint

Case No. 5 in the Senator's indictment is classification "in our recent hearings" of information which "has to do with the validity of arguments presented by the Soviet Union." He said, "A government witness in the course of his testimony suggested that the Soviet Union possibly had a valid objection to one of our arguments, but the Executive branch decided this ought to be censored."

The Senator agreed there was "considerable merit in not conceding too many points to your opponent in the course of a debate or in the course of delicate negotiations. On the other hand, if the American people are constantly fed the line that every Soviet proposal is by definition full of evil for us or that every Soviet fear is a trumped up Communist plot, then how shall we ever judge the genuine points of view of that nation and its people?"

The Senator's final thrust was that maybe there was so much censorship in the field of foreign policy because the government couldn't make up its own mind on just what its policy was.

Hopeful Nuclear Test Bulletin

The Feb. 15 issue of the London Observer says that Dr. P. J. Kellogg of the University of Minnesota, in an article for the British science journal Nature, reports that the newly discovered belt of intense radiation surrounding the earth in space "may provide a new method of detecting high-altitude nuclear explosions." High altitude explosions, like the underground ones, have been played up by the AEC as obstacles to effective inspection of test agreement. The Observer said Dr. Kellogg's observations "agree fairly closely with views held by scientists who have been working on somewhat similar lines at Bristol University" in England. It is interesting that first news of this important work by an American should come from abroad. If Dr. Kellogg reported that high altitude tests positively could not be detected we are sure it would be on our front pages.

You Really Can't Trust Those (Security Deletion) Capitalists

Mrs. (M. S.) CHURCH (R. Ill.) I have been rather interested in the comments that have come from certain of the industrialists in Chicago who were thrown in contact with him (Mikoyan), as to why they were in touch and how; and I wondered at what stage of the game the State Dept. became aware that there was being set up perhaps a pattern for non-governmental activity—almost under-the-table diplomacy. Or am I exaggerating what happened?

Secretary DULLES. Well, I don't think it really did a great deal of harm.

(Security deletion).

Secretary DULLES. I will say at this juncture that the representatives of labor took a position which is, I think, far sounder in the national interests than some of the representatives of business whom he met.

(Security deletion).

Secretary DULLES. The labor people really stood up to him and gave him a really strong statement of position.

Of course, Mr. Meany refused to meet with him at all.

—House Foreign Affairs Committee, Jan. 28.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Hidden Logic of the House Committee's New Attack on Communist Lawyers

A Witch Hunt of the Bar Leads to A Witch Hunt of the Bench

One of the crucial weaknesses of the Soviet legal system is that a Soviet lawyer is afraid to defend a man accused of being counter-revolutionary or anti-Communist. The lawyers assigned by the State are not trusted by defendants because in so many cases they merely facilitate the obtaining of a confession, true or false.

I could not help but think of this as I read the new report issued by the House Un-American Activities Committee on "Communist Legal Subversion: The Role of the Communist Lawyer." The Committee says unctuously that its report "must not be construed as a reflection on the right and privilege of legal representation for Communists."

But how do Communists, real or alleged, get counsel in an atmosphere where it is dangerous to defend them lest one be tagged as a Communist lawyer?

Making Lawyers More Fearful

When the House Committee issues a report naming 39 lawyers as Communists and concluding with a plea to bar associations "for prompt action" against them, it undercuts that right to counsel it purports to respect.

Over and over again these lawyers are accused of trying "to pervert our democratic processes." But what of the perversions in which the Committee engages? Is it fair, without trial, to issue a report stigmatizing 39 members of the bar as Communists and trying to initiate their disbarment?

Justice Requires An Independent Bar

An independent bar is as important to justice as an independent judiciary. The bar is best policed by its own membership under the supervision of the courts. The standards should be those of probity not politics. We think the bar can only suffer by the kind of surveillance to which the House committee has been subjecting it.

The report says that "more than 100" lawyers have been identified as Communists by former Communists testifying before the Committee since 1947. Some of the accused seem to have gained immunity by informing: "Approximately a dozen of them informed this Committee that they were no longer part of the conspiracy and presented valuable testimony regarding their past activities in the party."

The report complains that "no less than 67 other lawyers have refused to answer questions . . . despite sworn testimony regarding their affiliation with the conspiracy." The Committee itself seems to doubt some of that "sworn testimony" since its report only identifies 39 lawyers as Communists.

Should Communist Lawyers Be Disbarred?

Shall we assume that a proven Communist should not be allowed to practice law? If the test is to be ideas, what of non-Communists who share some of the same ideas?

Let us, for example, look at the standards by which the Committee proves to its own satisfaction what the Attorney General failed to prove—that the National Lawyers' Guild is a Communist front? The "subversion" alleged against the Guild consists of nine points, all of them having to do with defense of civil liberties. It is against the Congressional witch hunt—that, of course, is Point No. 1. It is for repeal of the Internal Security Act (which Truman vetoed). It is (like a whole group of Senators) for "unrestricted issuance of passports." It would (like the Supreme Court) put "limitations on the right of the Defense Department to discharge subversives from the Armed Forces."

If we disbar Communist lawyers, what of other radical, liberal *and* conservative lawyers who agree with many of the civil liberties issues raised by the National Lawyers' Guild? Shall they be disbarred, too? And if it furthers a subversive conspiracy to argue for strict enforcement of constitutional rights, what of Judges who rule that way?

A witch hunt of the bar leads logically to a witch hunt of the bench. Senator Eastland has already presented a statistical summary intended to cast suspicion on the courts. The really subversive conspiracy is being carried on by Eastland's Committee and Walter's in purported search for subversives. This is the paradox of which one should never lose sight.

IFS Speaks Sane Nuclear Policy Rally, Club 65, 13 Astor Place, NYC, 8 p.m., Thursday, Feb. 26

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*
Name .....
Street .....
City .....Zone.....State.....
Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:
2/23/59
(To) Name .....
Street .....
City .....Zone.....State.....
Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No. ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.
NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED